

Metadata Report Summary

**Report on METS to MoPark and
the Loch Lomond and
Trossachs National Park.**

**Dennis Nicholson
Centre for Digital Library
Research**



Metadata Options Appraisal

- **Requirement:**

- ◆ To examine – and make recommendations on - the needs of the Loch Lomond and Trossachs National Park as regards the metadata, metadata standards, and metadata management required for the competent handling of digital materials both now and in the future.
- ◆ Covering three levels of need: MoPark project (Level 1); Extension to other topics and Park areas (Level 2); Wider Park beyond MoPark (Level 3)



Investigation entailed...

- Participation in initial briefing session
- Initial analysis of the outcomes, in-depth consultation with project leaders
- Detailed examination of relevant project and Park documents.
- Creation of an outline sketch of project/ Park general metadata needs
- Examination of metadata issues and solutions adopted by prominent global digital library initiatives



Investigation entailed...

- Identification of a sufficiently complex and flexible metadata framework
- Identification of areas and issues requiring more detailed answers
- Creation of a set of questions that need to be answered in Phase II
- Creation of an outline plan to enable the detailed metadata requirements to be specified and implemented within the proposed framework.
- Production of the report



Findings (1)

- (1) Sufficient detail available from initial discussions with key MoPark and Park personnel (step 1), from follow-up discussions with project leaders (step 2), and from project and Park documentation (step 3), to enable the general needs of the project and Park in respect of digital object metadata to be specified.
- (2) Specifying the need in detail more difficult at this stage – that a phased approach was required



Findings (2)

- **Phased because it needs:**
 - ◆ Further work done with actual examples of the complex digital objects (interpretive journeys) likely to form the primary elements of the Level 1 and 2 requirements
 - ◆ More experience amongst project and Park personnel of the issues and problems associated with managing complex digital objects
 - ◆ An in-depth survey of the likely range of other digital objects, their usage, and their life-cycles.



Phased Approach...

- **Phase 1:**
 - ◆ Sets out a framework within which the full requirement can develop
 - ◆ Proposes a flexible development path that will facilitate the specification of the detailed metadata needs for Levels 1, 2, and 3 and lead to the determination of the full requirement
- **Phase II**
 - ◆ Implements the development path



Framework

- Has three elements:
 - ◆ Adoption of the METS *Metadata Encoding & Transmission Standard* (L of C standard for encoding descriptive, administrative, and structural metadata in a digital library, expressed using the W3C's XML schema)
 - ◆ Adoption of national and international standards relevant to the field.
 - ◆ Cooperation with other key players ensure interoperability beyond Park systems.



Why METS?

- **METS:**

- ◆ Provides for all of the metadata types likely to be required within MoPark and the Park
- ◆ Meets all of the general requirements of MoPark and the National Park
- ◆ Sufficiently flexible to allow it to meet the detailed requirements drawn out in Phase II of the appraisal.
- ◆ Provides a good guide to the areas we need to address



Why METS?

- **METS provides for:**
 - ◆ *Descriptive metadata* (MARC, Dublin Core etc) at both individual object and aggregate (i.e. Interpretive Journey) level,
 - ◆ *Administrative metadata* (technical metadata, rights metadata, analogue source information, digital object files provenance),
 - ◆ *Files metadata* (for files containing content which comprise the electronic versions of the digital object)



Why METS?

- **METS provides for:**

- ◆ *Structural Map metadata* to outline the hierarchical structure of a digital library object such as an Interpretive Journey
- ◆ *Structural Links metadata* to allow links between hierarchical levels to be described
- ◆ *Behaviour metadata* to allow metadata on 'executable behaviours' to be encoded
- ◆ In addition, required *workflow metadata* can be stored (header?)



The Way forward (Phase II)

- **Full programme detailed in Report:**
 - ◆ Discussions with Project, DAMS, Content creation staff on likely shape and form of initial interpretive journey or journeys and on any differences in shape, form, format, and so on likely to be entailed in respect of presenting these to visitors through different output devices (PDAs, web-sites, and so on).
 - ◆ Initial analysis & proposals on how best to use the METS framework for the journeys.
 - ◆ And so on..



A Safe Path...

- **METS framework provides for all of the complex issues faced by the Park**
- **It is supported or recognised as important by groups like L of C, JISC, Digital Library Federation, British Library, CDLR in Scotland**
- **Standards and cooperation essential for interoperability which is essential for inter-working**
- **Phased approach sensible**



Further Information

- **METS website is at** <http://www.loc.gov/standards/mets/>.
- **Questions:** d.m.nicholson@strath.ac.uk
- **CDLR:** <http://cdlr.strath.ac.uk/>

